

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Official Action dated January 24, 2007.

At the outset and before addressing the rejections raised in the Official Action, the Applicants have amended Claims 1-3, 5, 8 and 9 as set forth herein to recite the invention with more particularity and to obviate the rejections set forth in the Official Action. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter has been entered via the foregoing amendments to the pending claims

Claims 1-3, 5, 8 and 9 are amended; no claims are canceled or added. Consequently, claims 1-9 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly anticipated by Rowe (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0048669 A1).

Rowe is directed to a method and system for providing support to gaming machines or other devices of a gaming network. More specifically, Rowe discloses that its system 20 includes a network operations center 62 and that information, such as diagnostic and repair data, may be transmitted to the network operations center 62 from the gaming machines 22 or other devices of the networks 40, and from the network operations center 62 to those devices.

In traversing the rejection of Claim 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Applicants respectfully submit that Rowe is defective in that it fails to disclose “receiving a primary event message in the central server from one of the plurality of gaming terminals, the central server including an association data structure that facilitates identification of at least one application to process the primary event message; processing the primary event message with the association data structure to identify the at least one application to process the primary event message; and transmitting the received primary event message to the identified at least one application for processing,” as particularly recited in the independent claim 9.

The Applicants first respectfully submit Rowe does not disclose receiving a primary event message from a gaming terminal and processing the primary event message with the association data structure to identify the at least one application to process the primary event message, as particularly recited in independent claim 9. Rowe does not disclose an association

data structure. In contrast to the recited invention of claim 9, in step S8, Rowe's server 64 receives and analyzes a message transmitted from a particular gaming machine 22 to classify the content of the message into categories, such as "hardware error/fault, "software error/fault" or "system data/metric information" (See Rowe, pg. 5, ¶¶ 60 and 67). More specifically, Rowe does not disclose using an association data structure to identify least one application to process the primary event message. It is clear that Rowe's classification of the received message is completely disparate and distinct from the recited identification of at least one application to process the received message, as particularly recited in claim 9. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that Rowe fails to disclose "receiving a primary event message in the central server from one of the plurality of gaming terminals, the central server including an association data structure that facilitates identification of at least one application to process the primary event message; processing the primary event message with the association data structure to identify the at least one application to process the primary event message," as particularly recited in claim 9.

The Applicants further respectfully submit that Rowe does not disclose transmitting the received primary event message to the identified at least one application for processing, as particularly recited in claim 9. More specifically, after Rowe's server 64 classifies the message received from its gaming machine 22 in S8, the server 64 initiates a response to the gaming machine 22 in S9. The response may involve logging the message, generating a response message to the gaming machine or generating a service order to be filled out by a technician (See Rowe, pg. 5, ¶¶ 69 and 70). Rowe's server 64 does not transmit the primary event message to the identified at least one application for processing. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that Rowe fails to disclose "transmitting the received primary event message to the identified at least one application for processing," as particularly recited in claim 9.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Rowe fails to anticipate the subject matter recited in the independent Claim 9. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wells (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0115487 A1) in view of Thibault *et al.* (U.S. 6,061,274) (hereinafter “Thibault”) and further in view of Rowe *et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0013531 A1).

The primary prior art reference to Wells is directed to a closed loop gaming network 20 for transmitting information from a gateway or host 24 to one or more gaming devices 22. Wells teaches that in order to permit communications between various gaming devices 22 and the gaming gateway 24, communication links 28 are provided between the gaming devices 22 and the gateway 24 in a closed loop topology. More specifically, if there is a break in one of the links 28 of a first path in the gaming network 20, communications may be routed along an alternate path in the opposite direction of the closed loop gaming network 20 (See Wells, FIGS. 1 & 2 in view of pg. 5, ¶¶ 37, and 60-61).

The secondary prior art reference to Thibault is directed to a computer storage subsystem for transferring messages between processors of a director and between directors of a disk array in a closed loop architecture. Thibault teaches one or more front end directors 20-24 manage and translate read/write requests from host 10 into one or more requests corresponding to how data is stored on physical disk drives (e.g., Thibault, e.g., FIG. 1, 50-44). Thibault further teaches one or more back end directors, each of which controls plural disk drives. A director includes multiple processors 120, 122 and a message interface 150 that provides a mechanism for transfer of messages among different directors via ports 170, 172 and among the processors 120, 122 of a single director. (See Thibault, col. 4, lines 36-62 in view of FIG. 2 and 3). Thibault teaches a message memory 250 that includes dedicated areas 310, 312 to respective processors 120, 122. Message areas 310b, 312b of message memory 250 contain the data of messages being transmitted or received (See Thibault, col. 5, lines 45-52), while communication areas 310a, 312a of message memory 250 contain destination identifiers of messages being transmitted (See Thibault, col. 5, lines 52-64).

The tertiary prior art reference to Rowe *et al.* is directed to a system which a gaming system 40 in which a gaming machine 20 issues receipts, such as a receipt 60 of cash value or currency (See Rowe *et al.*, FIG. 3A) or a receipt of a complementary reward 160 (See Rowe *et al.*, FIG. 3B).

In traversing the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wells-Thibault-Rowe et al. combination is defective in that it fails to teach or suggest “receiving a primary event message in a routing queue of the central server from one of the plurality of gaming terminals; processing the primary event message to identify a first application queue associated with a first application to process the primary event message using an association data structure, the association data structure storing an association of the primary event message to at least the first application queue; and transmitting the received primary event message to the identified first application queue,” as particularly recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

The Examiner alleged that the primary prior art reference to Wells teaches receiving a primary event message in a routing queue of the central server from one of the plurality of gaming terminals. The Applicants respectfully disagree. As summarized above, Wells teaches communication links 28 between the gaming devices 22 and the gateway 24 in a closed loop topology, where if there is a break in one of the links 28 of a first path in the gaming network 20, communications may be routed along an alternate path in the opposite direction of the closed loop gaming network 20 (See Wells, FIGS. 1 & 2 in view of pg. 5, ¶¶ 37, and 60-61). Wells does not teach or suggest that its routing of communications via either path in the closed loop topology involves receiving a primary event message from a gaming terminal in a routing queue of the gateway or host 24. Specifically, Wells does not teach or suggest that its gateway or host 24 receives a primary messages from a gaming terminal 22 in a routing queue.

The secondary prior art reference to Thibault and tertiary prior art reference to Rowe et al. do not rectify the above-identified deficiency. More specifically, Thibault’s host 10 does not teach or suggest receiving a primary event message from a gaming terminal in a routing queue of its host 10. As summarized above, Thibault teaches that one or more front end directors 20-24 manage and translate read/write requests from host 10 into one or more requests corresponding to how data is stored on physical disk drives (e.g., Thibault, e.g., FIG. 1, 50-44). Specifically, Thibault’s does not teach or suggest that its host 10 receives a primary messages from a gaming terminal 22 in a routing queue. The tertiary prior art reference to Rowe et al. likewise does not rectify the identified deficiency.

The Examiner further alleged that Thibault teaches interface 150 that includes a message memory 250 that is the claimed association data structure. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit none of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest processing the primary event message to identify a first application queue associated with a first application to process the primary event message using an association data structure, the association data structure storing an association of the primary event message to at least the first application queue, and transmitting the received primary message to the identified first application queue. More specifically, the secondary prior art reference to Thibault does not teach or suggest the recited processing using an association data structure that stores an association of the primary event message to at least the first application queue that is associated with a first application to process the primary event message.

Specifically, the Examiner alleged that when Thibault's message interface 150 receives a message, the message is examined to determine if it is addressed to that director or to a different director. If to a different director, the message is transmitted to the next direction and if to that director, then message is written to message memory 250 and appropriate processor interrupted ... which processor then reads the message from the message memory 250. Thus, the Examiner necessarily concluded that this means that the message is addressed to that application.

To the contrary of the Examiner's allegation, Thibault does not process the message to identify a first application queue associated with a first application to process the primary event message using an association data structure and further does not transmit the primary event message to the first application queue. First, in examining the message to determine a director, Thibault does not teach or suggest using an association data structure. Second, in writing the message to memory 250 for a processor 120, 122, Thibault also does not teach or suggest use of an association data structure. Rather, the message memory 250 includes dedicated message areas 310, 312 for respective processors 120, 122. Third, Thibault's message is addressed to a processor not an application. A processor is a term of art that is disparate and distinct from an application.

Consequently, the Wells-Thibault-Rowe et al. combination fails to teach or suggest processing the primary event message to identify a first application queue associated with a first application to process the primary event message using an association data structure, the

association data structure storing an association of the primary event message to at least the first application queue; and transmitting the received primary event message to the identified first application queue,” as particularly recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 8, as well as claims dependent therefrom, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (516) 203-7270 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

RORY L. BLOCK ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(516) 203-7270

Date July 24, 2007

By / Alexander G. Vodovozov /
Alexander G. Vodovozov
Reg. No. 55,701

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 24 day of July 2007.

Name: Peter Rebiffeni

Signature: Peter R